

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claim 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Remaining claims 1-5, 10-13 and 23-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,969,696 (Stoye). Regarding claims 1 and 23, the office action alleges that Cho teaches a method for detecting a monitor by, inter alia, “monitoring pin of a connector coupled to a flat panel (see element 60 in FIG. 1) display (FIGs. 1-2; column 4, lines 31 to column 5, line 66; column 15, lines 6 to column 16, line 65)”. Applicant respectfully submits that Cho does not teach what is alleged. Cho does not show a connector coupled to a flat panel display. To the contrary, the flat panel 60 of Cho is shown being connected to the graphics processor 40 as also described in column 3, lines 3-7. There is no connector coupled to the flat panel display 60 in Cho. In fact, it appears that the display in Cho is integrated as part of a laptop device and as such, there is no connector coupled to the flat panel display as claimed. Therefore, the rejection must be withdrawn and the claims passed to allowance.

Cho is directed to a system having a portable computer connected to a docking station. An interface is coupled between the portable computer and the docking station that is responsive to unpreconditioned insertion and removal of the portable computer into or from the docking station. When the portable computer is being inserted into or removed from the docking station, the interface generates events to allow software to configure the portable computer in the docking station without prior user intervention. Applicant claims a completely different method and apparatus. As to claims 1 and 23, the claims are directed to a method and apparatus for

detecting a monitor. No such method or apparatus is described in the cited portion of Cho. To the contrary, Cho describes a method for detecting a portable computer being inserted within the docking station.

The claimed method requires monitoring one pin of a connector coupled to a flat panel display. As best understood, however, Cho only describes pins such as CD1# pin 201, CD2# pin 202, signal pins 203, a battery-charge pin 204, a ds_Vcc5 pin 205, NB_switched_Vcc5 pin 206, and ground pins 207. (*See, e.g.*, col. 4, lines 38-42.) None of these pins appear to be coupled to a flat panel display, as claimed in claim 1, for example. (*See, e.g.*, col. 4, lines 50-62 (describing the function of each pin).) Thus, as best understood, Cho certainly could not teach “monitoring pin of a connector coupled to a flat panel display” because Cho does not teach a pin of a connector coupled to a flat panel display.

Other limitations alleged to be taught in Cho are also not taught as recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art. In addition, the office action alleges that Stoye is properly combinable with Cho and that Stoye teaches “detecting a monitor, the method comprising monitoring one pin (50 in FIG. 2; column 3, lines 7-15) of a connector coupled to a flat panel display (see column 2, line 6 through column 3, line 15)”. However, the claim requires “one pin” and item 50 in Cho is actually a 68 pin “self configuring monitoring interface 50” (see column 2, line 17). As such, the office action alleges that 68 pins correspond to the claimed one pin when in fact Stoye teaches a different structure. In addition, the claim requires monitoring one pin and Stoye actually teaches using a plurality of pins namely sense signal pins 44, 10 and 43 which increase the size of the connector and requires the use of a plurality of signals to indicate the code and as such, multiple pins are required for use in Stoye. In contrast, Applicant claims, among other things, monitoring one pin. The claims are in condition for allowance at least one of the above reasons.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

As to claim 25, Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above and also notes that the office action alleges that Cho teaches determining when an external flat panel display becomes available by monitoring at least one pin of a connector coupled to a flat panel display citing columns 3, 4 and others. However, these cited portions do not appear to refer to determining when an external flat panel display becomes available by monitoring a pin of a connector that is coupled to a flat panel display as claimed. To the contrary, the cited portions appear to merely describe the various docking station pins in the docking station, none of which appear to be directed to the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn due to clear error and the claim should be passed to allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 16, 2008

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7500
FAX: (312) 609-5005